

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed September 5, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 7-14, 16, and 19; and objected to claims 2-6, 15, 17, 18, and 20.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 8-11, 13-17, and 19-20. In addition, Applicants have canceled claims 4 and 18. For the reasons provided below, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 2-6, 15, 17-18, and 20 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for this acknowledgement of allowable subject matter. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include all the limitations of claim 4 which the Examiner indicated was allowable. Thus, Applicants request allowance of claim 1. Claims 2-3, and 5-12 depend from claim 1 and thus should be allowed for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 1.

Applicants have amended independent claim 13 to include all the limitations of claim 18 which the Examiner indicated was allowable. Thus, Applicants request allowance of claim 13. Claims 14-17, and 19-20 depend from claim 13 and thus should be allowed for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 13.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 8-11, 13-17, and 19-20 such that the term “programmable logic device” is replaced with the term “integrated circuit.” Support for this amendment is provided at, for example, ¶ [0002] of Applicants’ specification.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 7-9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,615,162 to Houston (“Houston”).

As stated above, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include all the limitations of claim 4 which the Examiner indicated was allowable, and thus claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 7-9 and 12 depend from claim 1, and thus at least for that reason should also be allowed.

Claims 13-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,114,843 to Olah (“Olah”).

As stated above, Applicants have amended independent claim 13 to include all the limitations of claim 18 which the Examiner indicated was allowable, and thus claim 13 should be allowed. Claims 14 and 16 depend from claim 13 and thus at least for that reason should also be allowed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houston in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,257 to Keeth (“Keeth”).

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1 and thus should be allowed for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olah in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,568,062 to Kaplinsky (“Kaplinsky”).

Claim 19 depends from claim 13 and thus should be allowed for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 13.

CONCLUSION

No new matter has been introduced by any of the above amendments. In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and allowance of the application is therefore requested. If action other than allowance is contemplated by the Examiner, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone Applicants' attorney, Thomas George, at 408-879-4682.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Thomas George, 45,740 /

Thomas George
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 45,740

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed via EFS-Web with
the United States Patent & Trademark Office on December 4, 2008.*

/Katherine Stofer/
Typed Name: Katherine Stofer